

REMARKS

This reply is responsive to the Office Action mailed on March 3, 2006. A request for a one-month extension of time is included with this response. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10-14, and 17-20 are pending in the application. Reconsideration in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10-14, and 17-20 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Frey, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 6,922,688, issued July 26, 2005) (Frey) in view of Elledge (U.S. Patent No. 6,044,399, issued March 28, 2000). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Frey discloses a method to access an object in a computer system storage includes receiving a reference to the object, obtaining a referential map based on the reference (the referential map indicating a plurality of logical storage locations), each logical storage location associated with a portion of the object, and obtaining a physical map that is independent of the referential map from one of the logical storage locations indicated in the referential map, the physical map indicating a physical storage location of at least a part of that portion of the object being accessed. Computer storage systems providing distributed storage in accordance with this method and methods storage media having instructions to perform the method are also described. (Frey, Abstract)

Elledge discloses a software facility for inferring the identity of a preferred server for use by a computer system. The facility first reads system configuration information

describing the configuration of the computer system. The facility also reads configuration mapping information specifying a mapping from system configuration information to preferred servers. The facility then applies the read mapping information to the read system configuration information to identify a preferred server for the computer system. In some embodiments, the computer system proceeds to consume resources of the preferred server identified in this manner. (Elledge, Abstract)

The Examiner's attention is directed to the fact that Frey and Elledge fail to disclose a directory "wherein the directory is affected by the preference list", as recited in Applicants' independent claims 1 and 7, or a routing mechanism "wherein the routing mechanism is affected by the preference list", as recited in claim 14. Specifically, claims 1, 7, and 14 recite:

1. A system for distributing content to a client computer, comprising:
 - a server comprising a content object;
 - a first content cache at a first address, wherein the first content cache comprises a first copy of the content object;
 - a second content cache at a second address, wherein the second content cache comprises a second copy of the content object;
 - a preference list originating from the client computer, wherein the preference list comprises at least one of the first address and the second address; and
 - a directory located remote to the client computer, wherein the directory-maps at least one of the content object, the first copy, and the second copy to the client computer, wherein the directory is affected by the preference list. (emphasis added)
7. A system for distributing content to a client computer, comprising:
 - a content object;
 - a first content cache at a first address, wherein the first content cache comprises a first copy of the content object;
 - a second content cache at a second address, wherein the second content cache comprises a second copy of the content object;
 - a preference list originating from the client computer, wherein the preference list comprises at least one of the first address and the second address; and

a user-viewable directory that maps one of the first copy and the second copy to the client computer, wherein the directory is affected by the preference list.

14. A system for distributing content to a client computer, comprising:
 - a content object comprising a portion;
 - a first content cache at a first address, wherein the first content cache comprises a first copy of the portion;
 - a second content cache at a second address, wherein the second content cache comprises a second copy of the portion;
 - a preference list originating from the client computer, wherein the preference list comprises at least one of the first address and the second address; and
 - a routing mechanism that maps one of the portion, the first copy and the second copy to the client computer, wherein the routing mechanism is affected by the preference list.

The Examiner concedes that Frey fails to teach a preference list. In order to cure this perceived deficiency, the Examiner cites Elledge. The Applicant respectfully submits that neither Frey nor Elledge teaches, discloses, or suggests that a directory or routing mechanism is affected by a preference list.

Elledge describes a facility that identifies a preferred server by determining configuration information of the client. This configuration information may be an IP address or “drive mappings”, which, as described by Elledge, are defined in the client and map disk drive identifiers to remote file system directories. (See Elledge; col. 2, lines 45-55; col. 3, lines 46-48 and 63-67) In other words, the drive mappings of Elledge are used by the facility to identify a preferred server.

It appears that the Examiner has read “drive mappings” on the directory of claims 1 and 7 and the routing mechanism of claim 14. It also appears that the Examiner has read “preferred server” on the preference list of claims 1, 7, and 14. As stated above, the drive mappings of Elledge are used by the facility to identify the preferred server. As such, the drive mappings of Elledge are **not affected by the preferred server**. Frey, as

conceded by the Examiner, fails to teach a preference list. Elledge fails to teach a directory or routing mechanism affected by a preference list. Clearly, the combination of Frey and Elledge would not work in the manner as claimed by Applicants.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 7, and 14 are patentable over Frey in view of Elledge. As such, claims 2, 4, 6, 10-13, and 17-20 are patentable at least by virtue of depending from their respective base claim. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

Having fully responded to the Office action, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Should any issues arise that prevent early allowance of the above application, the examiner is invited contact the undersigned to resolve such issues.

To the extent an extension of time is needed for consideration of this response, Applicant hereby request such extension and, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account number 502117 for any fees associated therewith.

Date: 10/04/2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Thomas Bethea, Jr./
Thomas Bethea, Jr.
Reg. No.: 53,987

Motorola Connected Home Solutions
101 Tournament Drive
Horsham, PA 19044
(215) 323-1850